## ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 43

Proposition 63 is a <u>flawed attempt</u> to fix a serious problem. Californians are compassionate, and that's why we care about making sure that government is both responsible **and** effective. This tax initiative, however, is neither. It promises wonderful things, but the *benefit* is much smaller and the *price tag much larger* than proponents are telling you.

This new law forces the Legislature to continue funding existing mental health programs at their current levels, <u>regardless of effectiveness or efficiency</u>. While United States Department of Justice investigations have found severe abuses within California's Department of Mental Health, proponents suggest we expand that system rather than first resolving the problems it already faces.

As if that weren't bad enough, Proposition 63 pins the hopes and needs of thousands of Californians upon a narrowly-drawn segment of a few taxpayers' incomes. That is not wise, and it is not safe. Of course, most people aren't millionaires, but when those required to pay this tax end up leaving the state - the way they have been in increasing numbers since the Gray Davis days - they will take their tax dollars with them. The very same tax dollars this program needs to survive. That leaves the rest us stuck trying to pay the tab, and helplessly watching other important services get cut to make up the difference.

On paper, this plan promises a lot. Helping the mentally ill sounds good. However, the measure itself is fatally flawed, because its funding structure is too narrowly drawn and highly vulnerable to even slight economic changes. So, you see, the failure to provide a long-term solution for mental health needs in

SUBJECT TO COURT ORDERED CHANGES

## ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION\_63

our state will only create even **bigger problems** that need to be solved... and leave us with the original challenges, as well.

It is compassionate to help, but this plan is the <u>wrong way to do it</u>. It is time for real reform- not irresponsible measures like this one that merely substitute one broken bureaucracy for another. All Californians deserve a government that plans for the future, not one that threatens it with a nightmarish, risky scheme that will leave us with larger problems than ever before.

Join many Californians from all walks of life, including community leaders, state legislators, health care advocates, elected city officials, and others who care about the people in our communities in voting NO on this well-intended but short-sighted initiative. In the long run, this backward plan will only hurt those it's meant to help.

DR. WILLIAM ALLEN Professor, UCLA Department of Economics

THE HONORABLE RAY HAYNES Assemblyman, California State Legislature

LEW UHLER President, National Tax Limitation Committee

ORDERED CHANGES